

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 have been examined in the Application. Claims 1-44 currently stand rejected. The Examiner has objected to claims 1, 11, 21 and 34 because of certain informalities.

Claims 1-20, 26 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1,7,10, 11, 17, 20, 21, 26, 28-31, 34 and 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Onno (USP 5,170,272)

Claims 2-5, 8, 9, 12-15, 18, 19, 22-25, 27, 32, 33, 35-38, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) . Applicants respectfully disagree in part with the Examiner's objections and traverse these rejections for the following reasons:

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 11, 21, and 34 are objected to because they recite the term "bandwith" instead of "bandwidth". Claims 1, 11, 21 and 34 have been amended to correct this deficiency.

35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections

Claims 1-20, 26, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In particular the Examiner indicates that in claims 1 and 11 the recitation "...separate data and signaling of each channel ..." is unclear as to what channels are being referred to. Moreover, the Examiner indicates that in claims 7, 17, 26, and 37 the recitation "...wherein the narrowband transmissions

include an ATM cell..." is confusing. The Examiner further states that Claims 2-10 and 12-20 are also rejected because they depend on rejected parent claims.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 7, 17, 26 and 37 to clarify the claims rejected and to eliminate any confusion as to their meaning.

Reply to 35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 17, 20, 21, 26, 28-31, and 39-42 as being anticipated by Onno (U.S.P. 5,170,272). In particular, the Examiner indicates that Onno disclosed what is claimed in claims 1 and 11 of the present invention. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Onno and its application to the present invention. Onno discloses a subscriber terminal installation for use in an asynchronous network. The installation comprises a digital termination with a switching matrix and access modules each connected to a switching matrix and an asynchronous optical interface. One of the access modules is connected to a network digital termination, while each of the other access modules is connected to a terminal or terminal adapter. The terminal adapter comprises a multiplex adapter, a service adapter specific to a particular service, and a control circuit.

In contrast thereto, the present invention comprises a method and system for asynchronously transporting narrowband and broadband transmissions over a link in a manner that makes available the entire bandwidth of the transmission line for both broadband and narrowband transmissions. In operation, the present invention converts narrowband transmissions to and from composite asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) cells by separating data and signaling portions of the narrowband transmissions into separate byte positions in the converted composite ATM cells. The newly created composite ATM cells include both narrowband and broadband data which can be transmitted over the same transmission link instead of separate dedicated links thereby permitting the entire bandwidth of the transmission line to be available for both narrowband and broadband transmissions. Claims 1 and 11 clearly articulate this method whereas Onno does not teach converting narrowband transmissions into composite ATM cells adapted to carry both narrowband and broadband transmissions over the same

transmission link. Onno therefore does not anticipate the present invention and claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 17, 20, 21, 26, 28-31, and 39-42.

Reply to 35 U.S.C. 103 Objections

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-5, 8, 9, 12-15, 18, 19, 22-25, 27, 32, 33, 35-38, 43 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Onno in view of Hiller et al. (U.S.P. 5,327,421). The Examiner contends that Hiller discloses a system where a plurality of narrowband telephony channels are converted into ATM cells and when taken in combination with Onno, discloses the invention claimed in claims 2-5, 8, 9, 12-15, 18, 19, 22-25, 27, 32, 33, 35-38, 43 and 44. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiners characterization of the combination of Hiller and Onno. As discussed with respect to the Examiners 35 U.S.C. 102 claim rejections above, Onno does not teach or disclose a method wherein narrowband transmissions are converted to composite ATM cells. Hiller likewise does not teach this function and is instead directed to conversion of a signal stream into ATM cells not *composite* ATM cells capable of carrying both narrowband and broadband data for transmission on the same link as claimed in the present invention. Thus the combination of Onno and Hiller does not teach or suggest the present invention as claimed and does not render claims 8, 9, 12-15, 18, 19, 22-25, 27, 32, 33, 35-38, 43 and 44 obvious.

Request for Reconsideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the Office Action mailed on May 20, 2003, Applicant requests reconsideration in the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and requests that the Examiner allow claim(s) 1-44 and pass the application to issue. If there is any point requiring further attention prior to allowance, the Examiner is asked to contact Applicants' counsel who can be reached at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully,
Charles C. Byers
Mary D. Miller
Shella A. Paskel
James P. Runyon
John Tardy
John D. Unruh

By Claude R. Narcisse
Claude R. Narcisse
Reg. No. 38979
(212) 801-3190

DATE: February 26, 2004